REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1, 5, 10, 11, 14 and 17 are amended, and new claim 20 is presented. No new matter is presented in any of the foregoing and, accordingly, approval and entry of the amended claims 1, 5, 10, 11, 14 and 17 and new claim 20 are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-3, 6, 10 and 14-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Oprescu et al. (U.S.P. 5,483,656); claims 4-5 and 16-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Oprescu, in view of Chen (U.S.P. 5,881,300) and Examiner's contended admitted prior art of present application page 3, lines 3-24 (AAPA); and claims 7-8 and 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Oprescu, in view of Kurihara et al.(U.S.P. 5,721,937).

Claims 2, 3 and 15 are cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 1, 4, 6-14, and 16-20 are pending and under consideration.

The rejections are traversed.

CLAIM AMENDMENTS

Independent claims 1, 10, 11 and 14 are amended, using independent claim 1 as an example, to include the feature recited by dependent claim 2, cancelled herein.

Claims 4, 5 and 17 are amended to address informalities.

No new matter is presented in any of the foregoing and, accordingly, approval and entry of the amended claims are respectfully requested

ITEMS 4-6: OBJECTION TO CLAIMS 3-5 AND 17

The Examiner objects to claims 3 and 5 under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form, and objects to claims 5 and 17 because of informalities. (Action at pages 2-3). Claim 3 is cancelled herein. Claim 5 is amended herein as suggested by the Examiner.

Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's suggested amendment of claim 17 as not descriptive of the invention. Claim 17 is amended herein to address the informality and recite "controlling a supply of power comprises: supplying the power to said PC card when said judging judges that said PC card is used with a desired device unit, or when said judging judges that said PC card is used with the desired device unit and the desired device unit is connected to said electronic apparatus, and stopping the supply of stopping the supply of power to said PC card. . . . "

Withdrawal of the objections to claims 3-5 and claim 17 are requested.

Traverse of Rejections

According to aspects of the present invention, an electronic apparatus includes a judging part that judges whether a certain combination of detachable units realizes a desired function. According to the present invention, power is supplied to the judged combination to realize the desired function. Accordingly, power supply control is conducted based on a combination of a plurality of the units and unwanted power consumption is reduced.

Oprescu teaches (See, for example, cols. 7-8, starting at line 60) a power manager that determines whether sufficient power is available on a bus to which devices are attached. If sufficient power is available, the power usage request is granted.

Chen teaches (See, for example, col. 3 starting at line 35) that when a user designates stopping a use of a PC card, a driver to the card is unloaded from a memory and power supply is stopped.

AAPA teaches (Application page 3, lines 3-24) a system includes a DVD decoding card inserted into a PC card slot to decode data read by the DVD-ROM disk unit. The signals are converted to data that can be processed by the CPU so as to be displayed.

Kurihara teaches (See, for example, col. 7, lines 35-40) that a peripheral device is powered up every time a device driver is called up, and powered down every time data transfer is finished.

An *arguendo* combination of Oprescu, Chen and AAPA teaches a power manager that determines whether sufficient power is available on a bus to which devices are attached and if sufficient power is available, the power usage request is granted, when a user designates stopping a use of a PC card, a driver to the card is unloaded from a memory and power supply is stopped, and the system includes a DVD decoding card that is inserted into a PC card slot to decode the data read by the DVD-ROM disk unit.

An *arguendo* combination of Oprescu and Kurihara teaches that a power manager determines whether sufficient power is available on a bus to which devices are attached, and if sufficient power is available, the power usage request is granted and a peripheral device is powered up every time it device driver is called up, and powered down every time data transfer is finished.

Items 10, 11, 13: Rejection Of Independent Claim 1 (And Dependent Claims 2 and 6) Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) By Oprescu

The Examiner rejects independent claim 1 (and dependent claims 2 and 6) under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Oprescu. (Action at pages 3-5).

In contrast to the cited art, independent claim 1, as amended, recites an electronic apparatus, including "a judging part judging whether a combination of a plurality of units is to realize a desired function . . .; and a power supply control part controlling a supply of power from a power source to at least one of said units of said combination used to realize said desired function based on a judgment result of the judging part, based on an aspect of said combination of the plurality of units, wherein the judging part comprises: an identification information obtaining part obtaining identification information for identifying from said plurality of units; and an information judging part judging whether said desired function is realized based on the identification information obtained from said plurality of units, wherein said combination of said plurality of units is determined from the identification information."

Applicant submits that these features are not taught by the cited art as the Examiner contends, in the lines cited or anywhere else. In addition, Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner is making unsupported conclusory statements that are not in accordance with understanding in the art, and as such are unsupported taking of Official Notice. As set forth in MPEP §2144.03 Taking of Official Notice Is Unsupported: "It would not be appropriate for the examiner to take official notice of facts without citing a prior art reference where the facts asserted to be well known are not capable of instant and unquestionable demonstration as being well-known." (Emphasis added).

For example, the Examiner contends that Oprescu (col. 7, starting at line 49 and FIG. 1) teaches "a judging part (CPU) judging whether a combination of plurality of units (target device, inter alia a disk drive 16) is to realize a desired function (such as at accessing stored data on a disk drive)."

However, nothing in the lines cited by the Examiner, or anywhere else, in Oprescu teaches a judging part judging whether a "combination" of a plurality of units is to realize a desired function. Oprescu merely teaches (col. 7, lines 50-55) "power usage requests specify the identity of a device to be activated (a target device) and the operational status that is required for the device." That is, for the device, not the combination.

The Examiner further contends that Oprescu "teaches controlling a supply of power... to at least one of said units . . . of said combination (certain devices operate simultaneously) [col. 5 lines 21-37] used to realize said desired function based on a judgment result of the judging part, based on an aspect of said combination of the plurality of units (as a result of devices operating simultaneously to perform some action)." (Items ins parenthesis as quoted).

Applicant submits that Oprescu does not teach, in the lines cited, or anywhere else teach, controlling a supply of power to at least one of the units of the combination used to

realize the desired function based on a judgment result of the judging part, based on an aspect of said combination of the plurality of units.

Applicant agrees, as the Examiner contends that Oprescu that "not all devices connected to a bus need to be operated simultaneously." (Action at page 4). However, Applicant submits that Oprescu does not teach, as the Examiner contends, reducing "amount of power consumed by the system by powering only necessary devices to perform an action. The number of devices is based on the combination of units because Oprescu prevents an overload of the power bus." Applicant submits the Examiner's contention is an unsupported conclusory statement.

The Examiner further contends that Oprescu teaches "an identification information obtaining part obtaining identification information from said plurality of units (database receiving and storing information on all devices). . . ; an information judging part judging whether said desired function (for example the CPU requires data stored on a disk drive) is realized based on the identification information obtained from said plurality of units." (Action at page 4).

However, the database as taught by Oprescu does not teach obtaining information of a combination of the plurality of units. Oprescu teaches (cols. 5-6, starting at line 40) merely determining an amount of power being supplied to the bus, power requirements that a device is capable of drawing from the bus, and an amount of power the device is capable of supplying to the bus.

Conclusion

Applicant submits that the Examiner statements are unsupported conclusions that are not in accordance with standards as set forth by necessary to support the combination of prior art references. (See, Memorandum of Stephen G. Kunin dated February 21, 2002 based on *Dickinson v. Zurko,* 527 U.S. 150, 50 USPQ 2d 1930 (1999), attached).

Since features of independent claim 1(and dependent claims 2 and 6-10) are not taught by the cited art, the rejection should be withdrawn and claims 1 allowed.

Items 14-15: Rejection Of Independent Claims 10 And 14 (And Dependent Claim 5) Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) By Oprescu

The Examiner rejects independent claims 10 and 14 for arguments set forth in rejection of claim 1. (Action at page 5).

In contrast to the cited art, independent claims 10 and 14, using claim 10 as an example recite a judging part judging whether a combination of a plurality of units is to realize said desired function, said units being detachable from said electronic apparatus; and a power supply control part controlling a supply of power from a power source to said units of said combination used to

realize said desired function based on a judgment result of said judging part, wherein said judgment is based on an aspect of said combination of the plurality of units, wherein the judging part comprises: an identification information obtaining part obtaining identification information for identifying from said plurality of units; and an information judging part judging whether said desired function is realized based on the identification information obtained from said plurality of units, wherein said combination of said plurality of units is determined from the identification information."

Applicant submits that nothing in the lines cited by the Examiner, or anywhere else, in Oprescu teaches a judging part judging whether a "combination" of a plurality of units is to realize a desired function. Oprescu merely teaches (col. 7, lines 50-55) "power usage requests specify the identity of a device to be activated (a target device) and the operational status that is required for the device."

Conclusion

Since features of independent claims 10 and 14 (and dependent claim 15) are not taught by the cited art, the rejection should be withdrawn and claims 10, 14, and 15 allowed.

Items 16-17: Rejection Of Dependent Claims 4-5 And 16-17 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Oprescu in view of Chen and AAPA.

The Examiner rejects dependent claims 4-5 and 16-17 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Oprescu, in view of Chen, U.S. Patent 5,881,300 and Applicant's admitted prior art (AAPA).

In contrast to the cited art, dependent claims 4 and 16, using dependent claim 4 as an example, recite an electronic apparatus "wherein said plurality of units includes at least one device unit reading information and at least one PC card decoding the information read by the device unit, said judging part identifying a type of said device unit and a type of said PC card, and said power supply control part stopping the supply of power to the PC card when said judging part judges that said device unit does not use said PC card."

In contrast to the cited art, dependent claims 5 and 17, using dependent claim 5 as an example, recite "wherein said power supply control part supplies the power to said PC card when said judging part judges that said PC card is used with the desired device unit, or when said judging part judges that said PC card is used with the desired device unit and the desired device unit is connected to said electronic apparatus, and said power supply control part stops the supply of power to said PC card when said PC card is used with the desired device unit but the desired device unit is not connected to said electronic apparatus.

The Action concedes that Oprescu does not teach having PC cards to decode information read by a device unit, and does not teach wherein a type of PC card is identified and

said power supply control part stops the supply of power to the PC card when said judging part judges that said device unit does not use said PC card.

However, the Examiner contends that "Oprescu teaches a judging part that identifies a plurality of types device units and controls power to the device units accordingly."

Applicant submits that the cited art, alone or in combination does not teach features including a "judging part judges that said device unit does not use said PC card " Oprescu does not teach a judging part, but merely a CPU that transmits power usage requests. Chen does not teach the judging part. Chen teaches (col. 3, lines 35-40) that a user "explicitly designate(s)" stoppage of the use of the PC card. Applicant submits that is in understood in the art that a "user" does not teach a "part of an electronic apparatus."

Conclusion

Since features of dependent claims 4-5 and 16-17 are not taught by the cited art, alone or in combination, *prima facie* obviousness is not established and the rejection should be withdrawn and claims 4-5 and 16-17 are allowed.

Items 21-22 Rejection Of Independent Claims 7 and 11 (And Dependent Claims 8 and 12-13) Under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) Over Oprescu In View Of Kurihara

The Examiner rejects independent claims 7 and 11 (and dependent claims 12-13) under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Oprescu, in view of Kurihara. (Action at pages 8-10).

In contrast to the cited art, independent claims 7 and 11, using claim 7 as an example, recite an electronic apparatus including a "judging part judging whether a combination of at least two of said plurality of units is a predetermined combination; and a power source control part stopping a supply of power to at least one unit in the combination when said judging part judges that the combination is the predetermined combination."

The Examiner contends that Oprescu (col. 6 lines 15-20 and col. 5 lines 21-37) " has a table which determines which devices are currently working together to accomplish a function such as the keyboard and the display and printer" teaches the recited feature of a "judging part judging whether a combination of at least two of said plurality of units is a predetermined combination." (Action at pages 8-9).

However, Applicant submits that Oprescu does not teach " judging whether a combination of at least two of said plurality of units is a predetermined combination," but that Oprescu merely teaches (cols. 5-6, starting at line 21):

> . . . power requirements table 54 stores information specifying the two operational states of the mouse and the power required for each state. . . . As another example,

> a disk drive may utilize one level of power... each of various operations states and the associated required power levels (of the disc drive are maintained in the table.

That is, Oprescu does not teach a combination.

The Examiner contends that "Oprescu in sum teaches that it is advantageous to have power management control in a system having a plurality of devices that work together. Oprescu also teaches the opposite would have to hold. That is, a predetermined combination of unit that are not being used." (Action at pages 8-9). While the Examiner's contention may *arguendo* be correct, it does not follow from such a contention that Oprescu teaches the recited feature of "a judging part judging whether a combination of at least two of said plurality of units is a predetermined combination."

Further dependent claims recite features not taught or suggested by the cited art, alone or in combination, for example, dependent claim 8 recites a "judging part comprises a table storing predetermined combinations of two of said plurality, of units, and said judging part judges whether the combination is one of the predetermined combinations based on the table."

The Examiner contends this feature is taught by Oprescu citing FIG. 2. Applicants submit however that FIG. 2 does not teach any "predetermined combinations."

Conclusion

Since features of claims 7-8 and 11-13 are not taught by the cited art, alone or in combination, *prima facie* obviousness is not established and the rejection should be withdrawn and claims 7-8 and 11-13 allowed.

NEW CLAIM

New claim 20 presents no new matter and is provided to afford a varying scope of protection.

Claim 20 recites an electronic judging apparatus for "judging whether a combination of a plurality of individually detachable units is to realize a desired function, comprising: an identification information obtaining part obtaining identification information from each of the detachable units; and an information judging part judging whether the desired function is realized based on the identification information obtained."

These, and other, features of claim 20 patentably distinguish over the cited art, and are submitted to be allowable for the recitations therein.

CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: September 22, 2004

By: Paul W. Bobowiec
Paul W. Bobowiec
Registration No. 47,431

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501